

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 14 to 16 are pending. Claims 3, 4, 8, 10, and 14-16 are canceled. Claim 6 is amended. Support for the amendment may be found throughout the application as originally filed, for examples, pages 20 and 21. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for directing to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for lacking production of a tangible result useful to the user of the process or apparatus.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection. To advance the prosecution of the pending application, claim 6 is amended to recite a diagnostic system using the claimed method, further claims 3, 4, 8, 10 and 14-16 are canceled.

Accordingly, the rejection has been overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3, 8, 10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Servais et al, in view of Carter et al and Kempf et al. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Servais et al, in view of Carter et al and Michelson et al.

Applicants note the Office does not reject claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 3, 4, 8, 10 and 14-16 are canceled. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is obviated. Reconsideration and withdrawal the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. With regard to claim 6, the Office states the phrases “looking at the prediction from the model and apply either” at lines 31-47, “phenotypic value V_0 ” at line 29 and “censored value” at line 24 and the reiteration step (e) at line 51 are unclear.

In response, Applicants amended claim 6 to specify ‘using the prediction from the model to apply either’, ‘a phenotypic measured value V_0 of said data of said dataset of matching genotypes and phenotypes’ and ‘censored value in said data from said dataset of

matching genotypes and phenotypes' and '(e) reiterating steps of b) to d)'. Also, Applicants cancel claims 3, 4, 8, 10 and 14-16.

Accordingly, the rejection is obviated. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Objections to Specification and Claims

The Specification is objected for informality. Claims 3, 4, 6 and 8 are objected for informality.

As suggested by the Office, Applicants amend the specification to capitalize 'Stanford University' and claim 6 to remove duplicate step (a) and correct the terms 'center' and 'phenotype'.

Claims 3, 4 and 8 are canceled.

Accordingly, the objections are obviated. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, allowance of the pending claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHNSON & JOHNSON
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-3385
Dated: March 18, 2009
Customer No.: 27777

By: /Yunling Ren/
YUNLING REN
Reg. No. 47,019
Attorney for Applicants